

THE ROSEN LAW FIRM, P.A.

Laurence M. Rosen, Esq.
609 W. South Orange Avenue, Suite 2P
South Orange, NJ 07079
Tel: (973) 313-1887
Fax: (973) 833-0399
Email: lrosen@rosenlegal.com

Counsel for Plaintiff

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

SHANE PARK, INDIVIDUALLY AND ON
BEHALF OF ALL OTHERS SIMILARLY
SITUATED,

Plaintiff,

v.

COGNIZANT TECHNOLOGY SOLUTIONS
CORPORATION, FRANCISCO D'SOUZA
and KAREN MCLOUGHLIN,

Defendants.

Case No.

**CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR
VIOLATIONS OF FEDERAL
SECURITIES LAWS**

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Plaintiff Shane Park, individually and on behalf of all other persons similarly situated, by Plaintiff's undersigned attorneys, for Plaintiff's Complaint against Defendants (defined below), alleges the following based upon personal knowledge as to Plaintiff and Plaintiff's own acts, and upon information and belief as to all other matters based on the investigation conducted by and through Plaintiff's attorneys, which included, among other things, a review of Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC") filings by Cognizant Technology Solutions Corporation ("Cognizant" or the "Company"), as well as media and analyst reports about the Company. Plaintiff believes that substantial evidentiary support will exist for the allegations set forth herein after a reasonable opportunity for discovery.

NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. This is a federal securities class action on behalf of a class consisting of all persons and entities, other than Defendants and their affiliates, who purchased or otherwise acquired Cognizant securities from February 25, 2016 through September 30, 2016, both dates inclusive (“Class Period”), seeking to recover compensable damages caused by Defendants’ violations of federal securities laws and pursue remedies under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the “Exchange Act”).

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

2. The claims asserted herein arise under and pursuant to Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Exchange Act (15 U.S.C. §§ 78j(b) and 78t(a)) and Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder (17 C.F.R. § 240.10b-5).

3. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action pursuant to Section 27 of the Exchange Act (15 U.S.C. § 78aa) and 28 U.S.C. § 1331.

4. Venue is proper in this Judicial District pursuant to Section 27 of the Exchange Act (15 U.S.C. § 78aa) and 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) as the Company is headquartered in this District and a substantial part of the conduct complained of herein occurred in this District.

5. In connection with the acts, conduct and other wrongs alleged herein, Defendants either directly or indirectly used the means and instrumentalities of interstate commerce, including but not limited to the United States mails, interstate telephone communications, and the facilities of the national securities exchange.

PARTIES

6. Plaintiff Shane Park, as set forth in the attached PSLRA Certification, acquired Cognizant securities at artificially inflated prices during the Class Period and was damaged upon the revelation of the alleged corrective disclosures.

7. Defendant Cognizant is a Delaware corporation headquartered in Teaneck, New Jersey. Cognizant securities trade on the NASDAQ Stock Market (“NASDAQ”) under the ticker symbol “CTSH.”

8. Defendant Francisco D’Souza (“D’Souza”) has been the Chief Executive Officer (“CEO”) of the Company throughout the Class Period.

9. Defendant Karen McLoughlin (“McLoughlin”) has been the Chief Financial Officer (“CFO”) of the Company throughout the Class Period.

10. Collectively, Defendants D’Souza and McLoughlin are herein referred to as the “Individual Defendants.”

11. Collectively, Defendant Cognizant and the Individual Defendants are herein referred to as “Defendants.”

12. Each of the Individual Defendants:

- a. directly participated in the management of the Company;
- b. was directly involved in the day-to-day operations of the Company at the highest levels;
- c. was privy to confidential proprietary information concerning the Company and its business and operations;

- d. was directly or indirectly involved in drafting, producing, reviewing and/or disseminating the false and misleading statements and information alleged herein;
- e. was directly or indirectly involved in the oversight or implementation of the Company's internal controls;
- f. was aware of or recklessly disregarded the fact that the false and misleading statements were being issued concerning the Company; and/or
- g. approved or ratified these statements in violation of the federal securities laws.

13. Cognizant is liable for the acts of the Individual Defendants and its employees under the doctrine of *respondeat superior* and common law principles of agency as all of the wrongful acts complained of herein were carried out within the scope of their employment with authorization.

14. The scienter of the Individual Defendants and other employees and agents of the Company is similarly imputed to Cognizant under *respondeat superior* and agency principles.

SUBSTANTIVE ALLEGATIONS

Background

15. The Company provides information technology (IT), consulting, and business process services worldwide.

16. The Company's development and delivery centers and technical professionals are positioned globally, with the majority located in India.

17. As of December 2015, the Company had 45 facilities in India, 12 of which the Company owns.

Defendants' False and Misleading Class Period Statements

18. On February 25, 2016, the Company filed a Form 10-K for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2015 (the “2015 10-K”) with the SEC, which provided the Company’s year-end financial results and position and stated that the Company’s internal control over financial reporting and disclosure controls and procedures were effective as of December 31, 2015. The 2015 10-K was signed by Defendants D’Souza and McLoughlin. The 2015 10-K also contained signed certifications pursuant to the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 (“SOX”) by Defendants D’Souza and McLoughlin attesting to the accuracy of financial reporting, the disclosure of any material changes to the Company’s internal controls over financial reporting, and the disclosure of all fraud.

19. The statement referenced in ¶ 18 above was materially false and/or misleading because it misinterpreted and failed to disclose the following adverse facts pertaining to the Company’s business and operations which were known to Defendants or recklessly disregarded by them. Specifically, Defendants made false and/or misleading statements and/or failed to disclose that: (1) the Company made improper payments for gaining permits and building licenses for some of its 12 facilities in India; (2) the Company lacked effective internal controls over financial reporting; and (3) as a result, Defendants’ statements about the Company’s business, operations and prospects were materially false and misleading and/or lacked a reasonable basis at all relevant times.

The Truth Emerges

20. On September 30, 2016, the Company announced that Gordon Coburn resigned from his position as the Company’s President on September 27, 2016.

21. On that same day, the Company filed a Form 8-K with the SEC revealing, among other things, that it is conducting a corruption probe, which states in part:

Item 8.01 Other Events.

The Company is conducting an internal investigation into whether certain payments relating to facilities in India were made improperly and in possible violation of the U.S. Foreign Corrupt Practices Act and other applicable laws. The investigation is being conducted under the oversight of the Audit Committee, with the assistance of outside counsel, and is currently focused on a small number of Company-owned facilities. The Company has voluntarily notified the United States Department of Justice (the “DOJ”) and United States Securities and Exchange Commission (the “SEC”) and is cooperating fully with both agencies. The internal investigation is in its early stages, and the Company is not able to predict what, if any, action may be taken by the DOJ, SEC or any governmental authority in connection with the investigation or the effect of the matter on the Company’s results of operations, cash flows or financial position.

22. On this news, shares of the Company fell \$7.29 per share or over 13% to close at \$47.71 per share on September 30, 2016, damaging investors.

23. On October 4, 2016, The Indian Express published an article concerning the Company’s corruption probe, which stated in part:

Responding to queries on the case from The Indian Express, a Cognizant spokesperson said: “The investigation is currently focused on improper payments such as building licences, permits, etc., involving a small number of Company-owned facilities in India.”

24. As a result of Defendants’ wrongful acts and omissions and the precipitous decline in the market value of the Company’s securities and other Class members have suffered significant losses and damages.

PLAINTIFF’S CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

25. Plaintiff brings this action as a class action pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(a) and (b)(3) on behalf of a Class, consisting of all those who purchased or otherwise acquired Cognizant securities during the Class Period (the “Class”); and were

damaged upon the revelation of the alleged corrective disclosure. Excluded from the Class are Defendants herein, the officers and directors of the Company, at all relevant times, members of their immediate families and their legal representatives, heirs, successors or assigns and any entity in which Defendants have or had a controlling interest.

26. The members of the Class are so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable. Throughout the Class Period, Cognizant securities were actively traded on NASDAQ. While the exact number of Class members is unknown to Plaintiff at this time and can be ascertained only through appropriate discovery, Plaintiff believes that there are hundreds or thousands of members in the proposed Class. Record owners and other members of the Class may be identified from records maintained by Cognizant or its transfer agent and may be notified of the pendency of this action by mail, using the form of notice similar to that customarily used in securities class actions.

27. Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the members of the Class as all members of the Class are similarly affected by Defendants' wrongful conduct in violation of federal law that is complained of herein.

28. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the members of the Class and has retained counsel competent and experienced in class and securities litigation. Plaintiff has no interests antagonistic to or in conflict with those of the Class.

29. Common questions of law and fact exist as to all members of the Class and predominate over any questions solely affecting individual members of the Class. Among the questions of law and fact common to the Class are:

- a. whether the federal securities laws were violated by Defendants' acts as alleged herein;

b. whether statements made by Defendants to the investing public during the Class Period misrepresented material facts about the business, operations and management of Cognizant;

c. whether the Individual Defendants caused Cognizant to issue false and misleading financial statements during the Class Period;

d. whether Defendants acted knowingly or recklessly in issuing false and misleading financial statements;

e. whether the prices of Cognizant securities during the Class Period were artificially inflated because of the Defendants' conduct complained of herein; and

f. whether the members of the Class have sustained damages and, if so, what is the proper measure of damages.

30. A class action is superior to all other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy since joinder of all members is impracticable. Furthermore, as the damages suffered by individual Class members may be relatively small, the expense and burden of individual litigation make it impossible for members of the Class to redress individually the wrongs done to them. There will be no difficulty in the management of this action as a class action.

31. Plaintiff will rely, in part, upon the presumption of reliance established by the fraud-on-the-market doctrine in that:

a. Defendants made public misrepresentations or failed to disclose material facts during the Class Period;

b. the omissions and misrepresentations were material;

c. Cognizant securities are traded in an efficient market;

d. the Company's shares were liquid and traded with moderate to heavy volume during the Class Period;

e. the Company traded on the NASDAQ;

f. the misrepresentations and omissions alleged would tend to induce a reasonable investor to misjudge the value of the Company's securities; and

g. Plaintiff and members of the Class purchased, acquired and/or sold Cognizant securities between the time the Defendants failed to disclose or misrepresented material facts and the time the true facts were disclosed, without knowledge of the omitted or misrepresented facts.

32. Based upon the foregoing, Plaintiff and the members of the Class are entitled to a presumption of reliance upon the integrity of the market.

33. Alternatively, Plaintiff and the members of the Class are entitled to the presumption of reliance established by the Supreme Court in *Affiliated Ute Citizens of the State of Utah v. United States*, 406 U.S. 128, 92 S. Ct. 2430 (1972), as Defendants omitted material information in their Class Period statements in violation of a duty to disclose such information, as detailed above.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

Violation of Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act Against and Rule 10b-5 Promulgated Thereunder Against All Defendants

34. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained above as if fully set forth herein.

35. This cause of action is asserted against all Defendants.

36. During the Class Period, Defendants carried out a plan, scheme and course of conduct which was intended to, and throughout the Class Period, did: (1) deceive the investing

public, including Plaintiff and other Class members, as alleged herein; and (2) cause Plaintiff and other members of the Class to purchase and/or sell Cognizant's securities at artificially inflated and distorted prices. In furtherance of this unlawful scheme, plan and course of conduct, Defendants, individually and as a group, took the actions set forth herein.

37. Defendants, individually and in concert, directly and indirectly, by the use, means or instrumentalities of interstate commerce and/or of the mails, engaged and participated in a continuous course of conduct to conceal adverse material information about the business, operations and future prospects of Cognizant as specified herein.

38. Defendants employed devices, schemes and artifices to defraud, while in possession of material adverse non-public information and engaged in acts, practices, and a course of conduct as alleged herein in an effort to assure investors of Cognizant's value and performance and continued substantial growth, which included the making of, or the participation in the making of, untrue statements of material facts and omitting to state material facts necessary in order to make the statements made about Cognizant and its business operations and financial condition in light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading, as set forth more particularly herein, and engaged in transactions, practices and a course of business that operated as a fraud and deceit upon the purchasers Cognizant securities during the Class Period.

39. Each of the Defendants' primary liability, and controlling person liability, arises from the following: (a) Defendants were high-level executives, directors, and/or agents at the Company during the Class Period and members of the Company's management team or had control thereof; (b) by virtue of their responsibilities and activities as senior officers and/or directors of the Company, were privy to and participated in the creation, development and

reporting of the Company's plans, projections and/or reports; (c) Defendants enjoyed significant personal contact and familiarity with the other members of the Company's management team, internal reports and other data and information about the Company's, operations, and (d) Defendants were aware of the Company's dissemination of information to the investing public which they knew or recklessly disregarded was materially false and misleading.

40. Defendants had actual knowledge of the misrepresentations and omissions of material facts set forth herein, or acted with reckless disregard for the truth in that they failed to ascertain and to disclose such facts, even though such facts were available to them. Such Defendants' material misrepresentations and/or omissions were done knowingly or recklessly and for the purpose and effect of concealing Cognizant's financial condition from the investing public and supporting the artificially inflated price of its securities. As demonstrated by Defendants' false and misleading statements during the Class Period, Defendants, if they did not have actual knowledge of the misrepresentations and omissions alleged, were reckless in failing to obtain such knowledge by failing to take steps necessary to discover whether those statements were false or misleading.

41. As a result of the dissemination of the materially false and misleading information and failure to disclose material facts, as set forth above, the market price for Cognizant's securities was artificially inflated during the Class Period.

42. In ignorance of the fact that market prices of Cognizant's publicly-traded securities were artificially inflated or distorted, and relying directly or indirectly on the false and misleading statements made by Defendants, or upon the integrity of the market in which the Company's securities trade, and/or on the absence of material adverse information that was known to or recklessly disregarded by Defendants but not disclosed in public statements by

Defendants during the Class Period, Plaintiff and the other members of the Class acquired Cognizant's securities during the Class Period at artificially high prices and were damaged thereby.

43. At the time of said misrepresentations and omissions, Plaintiff and other members of the Class were ignorant of their falsity, and believed them to be true. Had Plaintiff and the other members of the Class and the marketplace known the truth regarding Cognizant's financial results and condition, which were not disclosed by Defendants, Plaintiff and other members of the Class would not have purchased or otherwise acquired Cognizant securities, or, if they had acquired such securities during the Class Period, they would not have done so at the artificially inflated prices or distorted prices at which they did.

44. By virtue of the foregoing, the Defendants have violated Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act, and Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder.

45. As a direct and proximate result of the Defendants' wrongful conduct, Plaintiff and the other members of the Class suffered damages in connection with their respective purchases and sales of the Company's securities during the Class Period.

46. This action was filed within two years of discovery of the fraud and within five years of Plaintiff's purchases of securities giving rise to the cause of action.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

Violation of Section 20(a) of the Exchange Act Against the Individual Defendants

47. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained above as if fully set forth herein.

48. This second cause of action is asserted against each of the Individual Defendants.

49. The Individual Defendants acted as controlling persons of Cognizant within the meaning of Section 20(a) of the Exchange Act as alleged herein. By virtue of their high-level positions, agency, and their ownership and contractual rights, participation in and/or awareness of the Company's operations and/or intimate knowledge of aspects of the Company's dissemination of information to the investing public, the Individual Defendants had the power to influence and control, and did influence and control, directly or indirectly, the decision-making of the Company, including the content and dissemination of the various statements that Plaintiff contend are false and misleading. The Individual Defendants were provided with or had unlimited access to copies of the Company's reports, press releases, public filings and other statements alleged by Plaintiff to be misleading prior to and/or shortly after these statements were issued, and had the ability to prevent the issuance of the statements or to cause the statements to be corrected.

50. In particular, each of these Defendants had direct and supervisory involvement in the day-to-day operations of the Company and, therefore, is presumed to have had the power to control or influence the particular transactions giving rise to the securities violations as alleged herein, and exercised the same.

51. As set forth above, Cognizant and the Individual Defendants each violated Section 10(b) and Rule 10b-5 by their acts and omissions as alleged in this Complaint.

52. By virtue of their positions as controlling persons, the Individual Defendants are liable pursuant to Section 20(a) of the Exchange Act as they culpably participated in the fraud alleged herein. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' wrongful conduct, Plaintiff and other members of the Class suffered damages in connection with their purchases of the Company's common stock during the Class Period.

53. This action was filed within two years of discovery of the fraud and within five years of Plaintiff's purchases of securities giving rise to the cause of action.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for relief and judgment, as follows:

- a. Determining that this action is a proper class action, designating Plaintiff as class representative under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Plaintiff's counsel as Class Counsel;
- b. Awarding compensatory damages in favor of Plaintiff and the other Class members against all defendants, jointly and severally, for all damages sustained as a result of Defendants' wrongdoing, in an amount to be proven at trial, including interest thereon;
- c. Awarding Plaintiff and the Class their reasonable costs and expenses incurred in this action, including counsel fees and expert fees; and
- d. Awarding such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury.

Dated: October 5, 2016

Respectfully submitted,

THE ROSEN LAW FIRM, P.A.

By: /s/Laurence M. Rosen
Laurence M. Rosen, Esq.
609 W. South Orange Avenue, Suite 2P
South Orange, NJ 07079
Tel: (973) 313-1887
Fax: (973) 833-0399
Email: lrosen@rosenlegal.com

Counsel for Plaintiff